



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,267	04/05/2005	Andrei Radulescu	NL 021031	3641

24737 7590 08/23/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/530,267

Applicant(s)

RADULESCU ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Phan

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on June 6, 2007.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emerson et al. (US Pub No. 2004/0103230) in view of Adams et al. (US No. 6,769,046).

In regard to claims 1, 7, Emerson et al. disclose the system on chip (i.e. SoC) comprising numbers of processing modules communicating within the chip (see figure 1, para 16-18) wherein the modules communicate via a SoC, the message between modules being exchanged over connection via a network (see para 35); wherein the connection supports transactions comprising at least one outgoing messages from the first module to the second module and return messages from the second module to the first module (see para 35). But Emerson et al. do not specifically disclose wherein the at least one connection comprises a set of communication channels each having a set of connection properties, the connection properties of the different communication channels of said connection being adjustable independently. However Adams et al. disclose the at least one connection comprises a set of communication channels each having a set of

connection properties (see col. 5, lines 17-28), the connection properties of the different communication channels of said connection being adjustable independently (see col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Adams et al. within the system of Emerson et al. because it would allow different transactions to occur simultaneously across different M-channels.

In regard to claim 2, Emerson et al. disclose further comprising: at least one communication managing means (CM) 102 for managing the communication between different modules (see figure 1, para 23); and at least one resource managing means (RM) 112 for managing the resources of the network (N) (see figure 1, para 28).

In regard to claim 3, Adams et al. disclose wherein said first module (M; I) is adapted to issue a request (REQ) for a connection with at least one of said second modules to said communication managing means (CM), said communication managing means (CM) is adapted to forward said request (REQ) for a connection with communication channels each having a specific set of connection properties to said resource managing means (RM), said resource managing means (RM) is adapted to determine whether the requested connection based on said communication channels with said specific connection properties are available, and to respond the availability of the requested connection to said communication managing means (CM), wherein a connection between the first and second module is established based on the available properties of said communication channels of said connection (see Table I-VI, col. 6, lines 9-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Adams et al. within the system of Emerson et al. because it would allow different transactions to occur simultaneously across different M-channels.

In regard to claim 4, Adams et al. disclose wherein said communication managing means (CM) is adapted to reject establishing a connection based on the available connection properties when the available connection properties are not sufficient to perform the requested connection between said first and second module (M, I, S, T) (see col. 4, lines 31-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Adams et al. within the system of Emerson et al. because it would allow different transactions to occur simultaneously across different M-channels.

In regard to claim 5, Adams et al. disclose wherein said communication managing means (CM) is adapted to request a reset of the connection between said first and second module (M, I, S, T), when said modules have successfully performed their transactions (see col. 9, lines 8-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Adams et al. within the system of Emerson et al. because it would allow different transactions to occur simultaneously across different M-channels.

In regard to claim 6, Adams et al. disclose further comprising: at least one network interface means (NI) (see col. 7, lines 30-35), associated to each of said modules, for managing the communication between said modules and said network (N) (see col. 7, lines 30-045 Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the

teachings of Adams et al. within the system of Emerson et al. because it would allow different transactions to occur simultaneously across different M-channels.

In regard to claims 8, 10, Adams et al. disclose the SOC including at least one switch and a router (see col. 4, lines 10-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Adams et al. within the system of Emerson et al. because it would allow different transactions to occur simultaneously across different M-channels.

In regard to claims 9, 11, Emerson et al. disclose the SOC is a chip wherein the processing modules and the network are disposed on the chip (see figure 1, para 16-18).

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's amendment and arguments, see on pages 3-6, filed on June 6, 2007, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35USC103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of Emerson et al. and Adams et al.

Conclusion

6. All claims are rejected.

7. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Calvignac et al. (US Pub No. 2003/010339) disclose a chip to chip interface for interconnecting chips.

Gadre et al. (US No. 7,165,128) disclose a multi-functional I/O organizer unit for multiprocessor multimedia chips.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM. The Group Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [hop://pair-direct.uspto.gov](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov). Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



Raymond Phan
Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2100